

From: Catherine Landers catherine.landern@lacity.org
Subject: Runyon
Date: July 25, 2016 at 11:00 AM PST
To: _____

Hi Pamela,

I just wanted to give you a heads up that Tim Deegan of CityWatch attended the Wed night board meeting and is going to be publishing a story today on the MOU. The quote our office gave last week said that the Councilmember isn't in favor of terminating at this time, but would open to strengthening or clarifying language, as well as take a look the Dept of Rec & Parks sponsorship/donor recognition policy. I wanted to let you know in advance. In particular, I'd like to emphasize the "at this time" part of the quote: there is still a lot more work to do to move forward, and right now our office has been focusing on the closure and reopening of the Park. Thank you for your continued thoughtful participation in the process, I really appreciate it!

On an unrelated note, I would love to chat with you when you have a moment about the springs that used to be in Runyon before the Metro came through.

Thank you,
Catherine

COUNCILMEMBER • DISTRICT 4
DAVID RYU
SERVING OUR NEIGHBORHOODS

Catherine Landers
Senior Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember David Ryu
Office: 323.957.6415
<http://www.davidryu.com/>

From: Pamela L
Subject: Re: Runyon
Date: July 26, 2016 at 2:30 AM JST
To: Catherine Landers catherine.landern@lacity.org

Thanks Catherine.

I know the Councilman is trying to balance competing interests, but I believe the community and the ELECTED Board of the HHWNC, are correct in concluding that FORC took actions that caused damage to city property, and did so in violation of the city's permit requirements, and ordinances.

In my opinion, once the Right of Entry Permit was issued to FORC, FORC, together with the donor and their employees (contractors) became the legally responsible parties.

Any payments made by any city agency, to repair public property that was damaged by FORC and/or the donor, in breach of the ROE, without obtaining permits, or following reasonable "good faith" protocols (i.e., bulldozing the historic old tennis court, AFTER the HHWNC's unanimous vote that the project be, at a minimum, delayed), should be reimbursed by FORC's insurer, or, if FORC violated that policy too, by the directors of FORC individually.

Again, just my opinion, not seeking reimbursement from the responsible party to the ROE, FORC, would be tantamount to financial mismanagement, and even, due to the undisclosed, close personal relationships between certain FORC board members and certain elected officials, potentially equivalent to something much worse.

FORC, and its contractors, like any other city vendor, was required to have insurance, AND they indemnified the city.

The policy of allowing RAP, the legally responsible stewards of our parks, answerable to our citizens and our elected officials, to skirt the city's ordinances about hiring contractors, it's own policies, and the city charter, is a situation that will only result in a continued waste of money on litigation and unnecessary expenditures, as your constituencies learn about RAP's secret projects, one by one.

The community has been very vocal about the request to dissolve the FORC MOU. I suspect they will be more vocal, in a more public manner as this drags on.

The Hillside Federation is not an elected body, and many of its members are private companies, formed by the individual private company's designated representative. Some of the HF members are not active legal entities.

The Hillside Federation letter set in support of the MOU, was misleading for many reasons.

1. It was sent by an organization that has at least two FORC board members on its own board.

2. One of the HF members, implicitly spoken for by the letter sent by HF is the Outpost Homeowners Association. The OHA has more than 400 homes within its area, and, as you know, the Board of the OHA voted to dissolve the MOU.

There are hundreds of CD4 voting constituents that support dissolving the FORC MOU. They do not wish to be represented in any manner by FORC or its directors.

Please let me know when you would like to speak or, better yet, meet up.

I am grateful for the head's up.

Sincerely,

Pam

On Jul 25, 2016, at 7:02 AM, Catherine Landers <catherine.landern@lacity.org> wrote:

Hi Pamela,

I just wanted to give you a heads up that Tim Deegan of CityWatch attended the Wed night board meeting and is going to be publishing a story today on the MOU. The quote our office gave last week said that the Councilmember isn't in favor of terminating at this time, but would open to strengthening or clarifying language, as well as take a look the Dept of Rec & Parks sponsorship/donor recognition policy. I wanted to let you know in advance. In particular, I'd like to emphasize the "at this time" part of the quote: there is still a lot more work to do to move forward, and right now our office has been focusing on the closure and reopening of the Park. Thank you for your continued thoughtful participation in the process, I really appreciate it!

1

2